Population, Employment, and Housing

This chapter describes historical and current population, employment and housing characteristics in the central Puget Sound region. It then describes how these characteristics could potentially be impacted under each of the growth distribution alternatives.

5.1.1 Affected Environment

A. PHYSICAL SETTING

The region’s urbanized area has developed along a (primarily) north-south axis formed by the Interstate 5, Interstate 405 and Interstate 90 highway corridors. Major population and employment centers are located in the region’s historic port cities of Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, and Bremerton on the edges of the Puget Sound and in Bellevue on the east side of Lake Washington along Interstate 405.

B. CURRENT TRENDS

The central Puget Sound region continues to be one of the faster growing metropolitan areas in the U.S. This section provides an overview of its historical and forecast trends in population, employment, and housing to establish a context for exploring the potential growth impacts among all of the alternatives.

Note: The 2040 forecasts presented in Figures 5-1-1, 5-1-3, and 5-1-4 on the subsequent pages represent the current modeled\(^1\) estimates of the projected 40-year growth in the region’s population, employment, and housing stock. These should not be confused with the 2040 distributions of regional population and employment under the alternatives discussed in Chapter 4 – Definition of Alternatives.

Population

The Region’s Population Today. The region was home to a population of over 3.5 million residents in 2006 and is forecast to continue to grow as people move here in pursuit of job opportunities and to enjoy the remarkable quality of life offered by the central Puget Sound area. The region has a relatively young and well-educated labor force in comparison to the nation.

Increased in-migration from other parts of the country and the world has enriched the region’s communities with a growing diversity of cultures, languages, and knowledge.

---

\(^1\) The data presented in this section has been drawn from the Regional Council’s 2005 Puget Sound Economic Forecaster (PSEF) model database of historical data inputs and forecast results. The PSEF is an econometric time series regional forecasting model that is driven primarily by national projections of economic growth and performance, the past performance of the region’s economy relative to the nation’s, and historical economic and demographic trend data for the region.
While the region’s population is wealthier on average than the nation, and average wages and incomes made significant gains relative to inflation during the 1990s, poverty levels in the region have not changed appreciably since a decade ago. Many lower- and middle-income households today struggle to meet the rising costs of living, particularly for items like housing, health care, and childcare (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy [CEDS], 2004).

Population Trends

**FIGURE 5-1-1: HISTORICAL AND FORECAST REGIONAL POPULATION, CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td>1,937,000</td>
<td>2,254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>516,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table reports population for July 1, as opposed to decennial census counts of population, which are for April 1; the 2000 estimates in this table are therefore slightly higher than the 2000 Census estimates used in the INDEX model’s base year database. Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, 2005 Puget Sound Economic Forecaster (PSEF) Model

**Recent Historical Trends (1970-2000).** The central Puget Sound region experienced substantial growth over the last three decades, increasing by over 1.3 million persons between 1970 and 2000. During this period, the region grew at an average annual rate of 1.8 percent, compared to 1.1 percent for the nation overall. The region grew at a particularly rapid pace during the 1980s, adding over half a million people at an average annual rate of 2.1 percent.

Historically, King County has, and continues to be, the central Puget Sound region’s most populous county, with more than half (53 percent) of the region’s total population in 2000. Pierce County is the next most populous county, with 21 percent of the region’s population, closely followed by Snohomish County with 19 percent. Kitsap County is the region’s smallest county, with 7 percent of the total population.

While King County received the largest share of the region’s population growth over the last three decades, the region’s other three counties grew at significantly faster rates, as growth pressures pushed suburban development farther out from the historic metropolitan cores. The populations of Snohomish and Kitsap counties more than doubled from 1970 to 2000, with both growing by 128 percent, at an average rate of 2.8 percent per year. Pierce County grew by 71 percent, at a rate of 1.8 percent per year. By comparison, King County grew by 50 percent, at a rate of 1.4 percent per year.

The last 30 years also witnessed some major demographic shifts that substantially affected the average number of persons living per household, both nationally and locally. Average household size declined significantly through the 1970s and 1980s, as women entered the labor force in increasing numbers and delayed childbearing, resulting in a drop in fertility rates and family size. Additionally, an increase in divorce rates, accompanied by the dissolution of formerly married-couple households, also furthered the decline. The region’s average household size dropped from 2.96 persons in 1970, to 2.58 in 1980, and 2.50 in 1990. Single-person households as a proportion of all households in the region rose during this period from 20.1 percent in 1970 to 26.2 in 1990.

These trends stabilized during the 1990s, with regional household size dropping very slightly to 2.49 in 2000. This was due, in part, to the rise in minority and immigrant populations with higher-than-average family sizes. Average household size can vary considerably from place to place. Among the region’s cities, average household size in 2000 ranged from a low of 2.08 in Seattle to a high of 3.13 in Covington.

**Forecasts (2000-2040).** The region is forecast to grow by an additional 1.7 million persons between 2000 and 2040, increasing 52 percent to reach a population of nearly 5 million by 2040. King County is expected to receive the largest share of the forecast growth, but, consistent with trends over the last 30 years, an increasing share of the growth is likely to be absorbed by the region’s other counties, with Snohomish County expected to show the fastest overall growth rate.

A major demographic shift that will occur over the 40-year forecast period is the aging of the baby boomer population. The population age 65 and older is expected to grow by nearly 150 percent, increasing from 10 percent of the region’s population in 2000 to 17 percent by 2040. The expansion of the senior population is likely to place new and unique demands on the region’s services and socio-economic infrastructure. The workforce population age 20-64, which represented 63 percent of the region’s population in 2000, is forecast to drop to 58 percent of total population by 2040. The population under age 20 is also forecast to show a proportional decline.
Average household size is expected to continue declining over the next 40 years, albeit at a much slower pace, due to downward pressure from the aging population, combined with some upward pressure from growing minority populations. The regional average household size is forecast at 2.22 persons in 2040. Smaller household size means that more housing units will be needed to accommodate the forecast growth in population relative to historic growth.

**FIGURE 5-1-2: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 1980 POPULATION AND 1980 TO 2000 POPULATION INCREASE**

Note: See note accompanying Figure 5-1-6, which explains the term "activity units." Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, 2005
In the past two decades, efforts to contain growth have had some success, as can be seen in Figure 5-1-2. While some level of growth has occurred throughout the region, a significant amount of the development occurred inside what is now designated as the region’s Urban Growth Area.

**Employment**

*The Region's Economy Today.* Many of the region’s traditional employment sectors, such as forestry, fishing, agriculture, manufacturing, and aerospace, have declined or seen little growth in recent decades. Forestry and fishing may decline further, while other new industries might emerge. Ongoing efforts to diversify the economic base have borne fruit, however, and have helped the region to better weather economic recessions.

Some new industries, such as computer-related sectors, biotechnology and life sciences, have grown particularly well in the past few years. New opportunities and markets have been opened with the rise of local companies gaining international prominence, such as Microsoft, Amazon, Paccar, and Starbucks.

Each county has a different, albeit similar, set of leading businesses and employers.

- **King County**'s major business and employers include: the University of Washington; local governments such as Seattle, King County, and others; private sector businesses such as the Boeing Company, Microsoft, Washington Mutual, and Swedish Hospital. In addition, a number of Fortune 500 companies are located in King County, including Costco, Nordstrom, Paccar, Safeco, and Weyerhaeuser.

- **Kitsap County**’s major businesses and employers include: the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Naval Base Kitsap; the school districts and Olympic College; private businesses such as Harrison Memorial Hospital, Johnson Controls World Services, TeleTech; and retail businesses such as Wal-Mart, Safeway, Albertsons, and Fred Meyer.

- **Pierce County**’s major businesses and employers include: the U.S. Army Fort Lewis and McChord Air Force base; the school districts and colleges such as University of Puget Sound, University of Washington-Tacoma, and Pacific Lutheran University; local and state government offices; and private businesses such as MultiCare, Franciscan Health Systems, and Good Samaritan Hospitals; retail establishments such as Fred Meyer, and gambling industries such as the Emerald Queen Casino, and manufacturing establishments such as Intel-DuPont, and Milgard.

- **Snohomish County**’s major business and employers include: Boeing; Premera health systems and Providence medical centers; the Tulalip Tribe’s casino and administrative offices; Naval Station Everett; local and state governments; and school districts and community colleges.

The region is also home to a very strong and growing small- and medium-sized business sector. As of 2003, 82 percent of all establishments in the region had 10 or fewer employees (almost 14 percent of total covered employment), with over 16 percent of the remaining establishments falling into the 10 to 99 employees range (almost 35 percent of total covered employment). These percentages are almost exactly the same in each county (CEDS, 2004).
Recent Historical Trends (1970-2000). Total employment estimates for 1970 and 2000 reveal that the region’s jobs base more than doubled over the last 30 years, rising from about 760,000 jobs to 1.9 million. The regional job growth rate for this period, for all employment, including military, averaged 3.1 percent per year. This is a full percentage point higher than that of the nation, which grew at 2.1 percent per year on average. A strong regional economy acts as a magnet for in-migration by job seekers and contributed to robust population growth during this period, at 1.8 percent per year compared to 1.1 percent for the nation.

Consistent with trends in the national economy, the central Puget Sound region made a structural shift away from its traditional manufacturing, industrial, and resources base toward a services base during the latter part of the 20th century. Historically the region relied heavily on its manufacturing sector, most notably on the aerospace industry, which is dominated by Boeing. Historical employment trends are characterized by dramatic fluctuations, brought on by upswings and downturns in manufacturing. While the aerospace industry continues to go through significant hiring and lay-off cycles, its impacts on the regional economy have become less severe. The growth and emergence of other industries resulted in the expansion and diversification of the economy, primarily in the services sector, leading to greater overall stability in the region.
Of the 1.15 million jobs added to the region from 1970 to 2000, more than half were added by firms classified under the services sector category. Correspondingly, the proportion of the region’s jobs in services grew from 24 percent to 42 percent. Manufacturing declined in terms of its share of the region’s total employment from 19 percent in 1970 to 11 percent in 2000, but the sector still added 72,000 jobs during this period, despite a national trend of declining manufacturing jobs.

King County serves as the core of the region’s jobs base, with 69 percent of total non-military employment, or seven out of every 10 of the region’s jobs in 2000. Pierce County had 14 percent of the region’s non-military employment, followed by Snohomish County with 13 percent, and Kitsap County with 4 percent. (Note: The employment shares for Kitsap and Pierce counties would increase with the inclusion of active enlisted military personnel.)

From 1970 to 2000, the region’s growth in total non-military employment averaged 3.4 percent per year. King County’s jobs base expanded at a rate in line with the regional average. Snohomish County recorded the highest growth rate at 3.9 percent per year, while Kitsap County posted slightly below the regional average at 3.2 percent, and Pierce County showed the lowest rate at 2.9 percent.

Most recently, the region, along with the nation, experienced a significant economic boom during the late 1990s that was uniquely characterized by the rise of technology industries and firms. “High tech” industry sectors accounted for roughly one out of every five jobs created in the region from 1995 to 2001, with Seattle and east King County emerging as major centers of such activity. A series of economic shocks during 2000 and 2001, including the “dot-com bust,” subsequent NASDAQ crash and stock market decline, as well as the September 2001 terrorist attacks, dealt a particularly severe blow to the central Puget Sound economy, sending the region into a recession that was deeper and longer than the nation’s. The region has since succeeded in making its economic recovery, with current job growth rates now surpassing the national average.

**Industry Clusters.** In 2004-2005, the central Puget Sound region engaged in a process, called the Prosperity Partnership, to develop a Regional Economic Strategy. The Strategy, which was adopted in September 2005, is meant to guide economic development priorities and efforts, and will serve as the functional economic plan for VISION 2040. The Strategy focuses on reinforcing six economic foundation areas that are key to the health of the region’s economy: education, technology commercialization, new and small businesses, tax structure, transportation, and social capital and quality of life. It also focuses on supporting 15 identified regionally significant industry clusters, with five prioritized for the first phase of activities — aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, and international trade and logistics. The following table presents data on these clusters and the trends for each over the past decade. Forecast data do not exist for these specific industry clusters.

---

2 The term “high-tech” encompasses those industries that directly advance technology. The Regional Council’s definition of high-tech industries began with the definition developed by the U.S. Department of Labor. This definition compares the proportion of technology-oriented workers and relative amount of research and development expenditures for a given industry, to the average for all industries. The Regional Council further refined this definition to tailor it to the central Puget Sound economy as including aerospace (non-Boeing), biotechnology, chemicals and allied products, computer-related, electronic equipment, instruments and related products, software, and telecommunications. Although Boeing is clearly a high-tech firm, it is excluded from the Regional Council’s definition to allow for analysis of the high-tech industry independent of Boeing-specific characteristics and trends.
FIGURE 5-1-4: EMPLOYMENT BY REGIONAL ECONOMIC STRATEGY INDUSTRY CLUSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>58,795</td>
<td>39,251</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30,296</td>
<td>21,618</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>90,457</td>
<td>62,101</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Building</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp;</td>
<td>10,043</td>
<td>12,804</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13,351</td>
<td>17,155</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing,</td>
<td>11,862</td>
<td>10,970</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13,982</td>
<td>17,295</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; PR</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>168%</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Technology</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>400%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>139%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>168%</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Shopping</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>526%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>43,911</td>
<td>75,652</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>51,463</td>
<td>84,862</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>12,481</td>
<td>14,423</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>4,786</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16,375</td>
<td>20,689</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics &amp;</td>
<td>32,182</td>
<td>30,843</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>39,670</td>
<td>39,165</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Trade</td>
<td>5,458</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td>16,408</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Care</td>
<td>5,458</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td>16,408</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Recording</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Food</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13,499</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Products</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>10,725</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199,775</td>
<td>217,974</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4,612</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19,467</td>
<td>24,129</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48,715</td>
<td>45,853</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>272,569</td>
<td>294,967</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asterisks indicate data that is suppressed per agreement with the state Economic Security Department. Because of suppression, the figures may differ from the totals.

Over the past decade, these clusters have grown by 8 percent across the region, however, some clusters have grown faster than this rate and others have actually declined. Of all the clusters, at the regional level and during this time period, the fastest growing cluster has been Electronic Shopping, and the clusters experiencing the greatest declines were Sound Recording and Aerospace. Note: Data suppression requirements prevent further analysis at the county level.

**Forecasts (2000-2040).** Current forecasts of regional employment show the central Puget Sound region adding another 1.2 million jobs between 2000 and 2040, bringing the regional jobs base to over 3.1 million, an increase of 64 percent, at an average rate of 1.2 percent per year. The projected rate of job growth is lower than what was recorded between 1970 and 2000, which is consistent with national economic and demographic trends. Causes for the slower growth could include increased foreign business competition and a proportional decrease in the available labor force due to the aging of the population and the leveling off of women entering the workforce.

However, in terms of absolute job growth, the forecast shows between 300,000 and 350,000 jobs being added each decade, a figure comparable to the 324,000 jobs added during 1970-1980 and the 386,000 jobs added during 1990-2000. (Note: The current regional forecast recognizes the impacts of the economic recession that occurred in the early part of the 2000-2010 time frame, showing an increase of only 218,000 jobs during that span.)

The current forecast expects the services sector to play an even more prominent role in regional job growth in the future, compared to the last 30 years. The services sector is projected to produce more than 70 percent, or over 870,000, of the 1.2 million jobs that are forecast to be added to the region over the next 40 years. By 2040, the forecast shows over one of every two jobs in the region belonging in the services sector. It is important to note that the Services sector includes a wide variety of industries — each with differing land use impacts and characteristics — and includes information and communications technology firms.

Consistent with historical trends, a continued reduction in the proportion of regional employment is projected for the manufacturing sector, as the forecast shows a loss of nearly 60,000 manufacturing jobs from 2000 to 2040, lowering its share of total regional employment to 5 percent.
Housing

*The Region's Housing Today.* The economic boom of the late 1990s generated a significant rise in demand for housing across the region, particularly around its major employment centers. Housing demand, buoyed by in-migration, wealth creation, and decreasing mortgage loan rates, intersected with a tight housing supply to produce rapid increases in housing prices. From 1997 to 2003, average rents in the region’s four counties rose between 20 to 33 percent, and median home resale prices increased between 36 to 55 percent. However, rent increases slowed for a period in the early years 2000s, but are again on the rise.

Historically low mortgage and refinancing rates helped to mitigate rising prices and resulted in expanded homeownership opportunities for many households. On the other hand, low- and medium-income renters and potential first-time home buyers whose salaries and wages have lagged behind the market have found it increasingly difficult to find affordable housing near their jobs.

Construction of affordable housing involves the use of many tools. Increasing the number of units built on existing lots, near employment centers and transit, could likely be important in order to meet the region’s housing needs. Options like townhouses, apartment buildings, small lot single-family homes, as well as shared lot cottage- or cluster-housing developments, can offer affordable homeownership opportunities. Many local land use regulations also allow for accessory (mother-in-law) dwelling units. Transit-oriented development (TOD) provides housing in walkable neighborhoods near transit, which encourages residents to give up one or more motor vehicles, further reducing the cost of living. While many of these tools are currently being used in the region, little data exists to assess the extent to which these tools are being used and whether they are having an impact on generating housing units that are affordable.

**Housing Trends**

**FIGURE 5-1-5: HISTORICAL AND FORECAST REGIONAL HOUSING STOCK BY STRUCTURE TYPE, CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>681,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,146,000</td>
<td>1,352,000</td>
<td>1,547,000</td>
<td>1,797,000</td>
<td>2,037,000</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Single Family</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Multifamily</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Change | 219,000 | 246,000 | 206,000 | 196,000 | 249,000 | 240,000 | 274,000 | 959,000 |
| % Single Family | 60% | 57% | 66% | 62% | 57% | 52% | 51% | 55% |
| % Multifamily | 40% | 43% | 34% | 38% | 43% | 48% | 49% | 45% |


**Recent Historical Trends (1970-2000).** In 2000, the region’s housing stock was comprised of 1.35 million units, roughly 30 percent of which were multifamily housing (e.g., condominiums and apartments) and the other 70 percent of which were single-family housing (e.g., detached single-family homes, attached townhouse units, and mobile homes). In 1970, by comparison, the ratio of multifamily to single-family housing was substantially lower.

Over the last 30 years, a significant share of the new construction built to accommodate the region’s growing population consisted of multifamily development, roughly four out of every 10 units built. In King County, the region’s most heavily developed county, multifamily housing represented about half of all new construction during this period. This is in part because of market factors (i.e., demographic trends such as staying single longer and marrying later, delaying childbirth, increasing divorce rates — all of which increased demand for smaller, more urban housing units) and also because of regulatory efforts to concentrate growth and curb sprawl. The adoption of Washington’s Growth Management Act in 1990 and its policy direction to provide a diversity of housing types and opportunities affordable to all economic segments of the population, has further encouraged many local governments to adopt ordinances and regulations allowing for multifamily housing, mixed-use and infill development in more places. Various other innovative housing approaches that promote the efficient use of land, such as accessory dwelling units, small lot single-family housing, and cluster housing, are also being used.
In recent years, housing affordability has emerged as a growing issue of concern in many metropolitan areas across the U.S., particularly in the western states. A surge in demand for housing, spurred by population growth and wealth increases during the late 1990s, historically low mortgage rates, growing interest from first time home buyers, and an increase in real estate investment as well as some speculation, led to rapidly rising home prices in the central Puget Sound region and many other metropolitan areas. Higher rates for labor and materials have also led to higher construction costs. Average rents increased rapidly in response to heightened demand during the late 1990s, and while they stabilized for a period as a result in the early 2000s, rents are once again on the rise.

For many, the increase in home prices and rents exceeded income gains, raising housing cost burdens, particularly for low-income renters and first time homebuyers. Affordable housing initiatives by local governments, such as affordable housing targets in countywide planning policies, are seen by many as being critical to meeting the housing needs of the region’s low- and even moderate-income households.

**Forecasts (2000-2040).** Forecasts suggest that construction of nearly 1 million net new housing units might be needed between 2000 and 2040 to house the region’s projected population increase of 1.7 million additional persons, an increase of 71 percent to the existing housing stock. Given the expected decline in average household size, more housing units are likely to be needed to accommodate future population growth, 1 unit per 1.77 persons, relative to the last 30 years, when 1 unit was built per 2.02 persons. It is expected that future housing construction will be comprised by a greater share of multifamily housing than during the past.

Depending on where the region’s 2000-2040 population growth actually occurs, as directed by both public policy and the development market, the ratio of multifamily to single-family new housing construction would likely vary. If development is directed to the region’s more heavily built-out urban areas, higher land prices and the lack of vacant developable land could likely result in more multifamily housing. In contrast, if development were directed to outlying areas, where more vacant developable land is available, more single-family housing could likely be constructed.

**C. REGULATORY SETTING**

The current statutory regulations guiding regional and local planning for population, employment, and housing growth are largely set forth in the Washington State Growth Management Act.

Under the Growth Management Act, all four counties in the central Puget Sound region are required to conduct long-range growth planning to accommodate 20-year forecasts of population growth, which are developed by the state Office of Financial Management. Each county has adopted population growth planning targets,\(^3\) which are then allocated among each county’s jurisdictions through a collaborative process unique to each county. While the legal mandates of the Growth Management Act require jurisdictions to plan for a 20-year estimate of population growth, additional components to growth planning have been put into place through countywide planning policy provisions. The countywide planning policies for King and Snohomish counties, for example, have required their jurisdictions to also plan for employment growth.

Furthermore, in the central Puget Sound region, the Growth Management Act requires the adoption of multicounty planning policies. These are prepared and maintained by the Puget Sound Regional Council. The central Puget Sound’s proposed multicounty planning policies are contained in VISION 2040, the region’s long-range growth management, economic and transportation strategy.

Each city and county prepares its own comprehensive plan to accommodate growth projections under the Growth Management Act. When adopted, each plan is subject to review for consistency with the VISION at the regional, county and local level. Thus, the adoption of a preferred growth strategy will be a critical overarching component of how the central Puget Sound region will accommodate expected population growth, both in the 20-year Growth Management Act and 35-year VISION 2040 planning horizons. Also, it could be through mechanisms such as each county’s growth targets process that the VISION’s preferred growth alternative is implemented.

---

\(^3\) For more information, see the VISION 2020 Issue Paper on Growth Targets – Growth Management By the Numbers: Population, Household, and Employment Growth Targets in the Central Puget Sound Region. July 2005. This paper is presented in FEIS Appendices - Appendix I-F.
5.1.2 Analysis of Alternatives (Long-Term Impacts)

This section describes and analyzes the macro-level impacts from population and employment growth that are likely to occur under each of the alternatives. Several such impacts are described in broad terms in this section, and will be further expanded with more detail in subsequent chapters, particularly in Chapters 5.2 – Land Use and 5.3 – Transportation.

All of the alternatives assume the same amount of regional growth in population and employment from 2000 to 2040 — 1.7 million additional persons and 1.2 million additional jobs. What differs between the alternatives is how this growth is allocated among the six regional geographies — metropolitan cities, core cities, larger cities, small cities, unincorporated urban areas, and rural areas — and among the region’s four counties. For the purposes of this analysis, the alternatives all assume that the currently adopted urban growth area boundaries do not change.

A. IMPACTS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVEs

Land Use and Development Patterns

Under all of the alternatives, each of the six regional geography categories and the region’s four counties will need to accommodate some degree of additional growth and population and employment density over what exists today. It is likely that growth directed to already built areas of the region, where there is less vacant developable land, could result in higher density residential, commercial and mixed-use development, as well as encourage infill and redevelopment activity. The regional forecasts used in the VISION process assume a shrinking in household size, which mean a stronger market for these types of development patterns.

Population growth in these areas could be accommodated in large measure through new construction and conversion of existing land uses to smaller lot single-family and various forms for multifamily housing. Conversely, growth directed to less developed areas of the region, where there is more vacant or easily redevelopable land, could more likely result in lower density single-family and commercial land use patterns. Growth in the region’s rural areas could likely add development pressures on nearby agricultural and resource lands and open spaces. For additional detail, see Chapter 5.2 – Land Use.

Housing

Housing figures are not part of the definition of alternatives. However, based on demographic and economic trends that affect housing supply and demand, housing supply is discussed in qualitative terms. There are trade-off impacts to housing costs related to land use and development patterns. Under all alternatives, growth in population and economic activity could likely produce some added complexities to meeting housing demands. There is the potential for low-income households in affordable urban neighborhoods to be displaced by higher income households, unless adequate affordable housing opportunities are provided. The potential for such displacement to occur tends to rise during periods of rapid economic growth, when housing construction often lags behind the demand created by the influx of new workers and their families.

All else held constant, land and development costs are typically lower per multifamily unit than per single-family unit. However, land costs are generally higher in dense existing urban communities, and lower in outlying and less developed areas. In already built urban communities, the potential complexities associated with infill, redevelopment, and mixed-use projects are also an issue. The costs of building new or expanded infrastructure are higher in undeveloped areas, which also translate to potentially higher housing costs. Moreover, transportation costs for households in areas farther out are likely to be higher than those for households in existing urban communities where there is generally better access to transit and other services.4

For more information on development costs under different land use patterns, see the VISION 2020 Issue Paper on the Costs of Sprawl. This paper is presented in FEIS Appendices - Appendix I-F.

B. ANALYSIS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE

For each alternative, the impacts of growth in population and employment are assessed. The impacts of growth under the Growth Targets Extended Alternative are discussed relative to the base year 2000 distributions of population and employment, and the impacts of growth under the other four alternatives are analyzed and compared to the Growth Targets Extended Alternative.

---

4 For more information on development costs under different land use patterns, see the VISION 2020 Issue Paper on the Costs of Sprawl. This paper is presented in FEIS Appendices - Appendix I-F.
Preferred Growth Alternative

The Preferred Growth Alternative has a focused growth pattern that concentrates population and employment into the region's designated urban growth areas. Within the urban growth area, the bulk of urban growth is distributed to cities with regional and countywide growth centers. Relative to current plans (Growth Targets Extended Alternative), this alternative improves the balance in distribution of jobs and population across counties and regional geographies. The following figure presents a conceptual map of the distribution of new growth under the Preferred Growth Alternative.

FIGURE 5-1-6: PGA CONCEPTUAL MAP: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS

Notes: (1) For conceptual maps: Regional Council staff used INDEX, a software analysis tool (see FEIS Appendices - Appendix I-E for additional information), to paint or assign population and employment growth at the 5.5-acre grid cell level. The painting was guided by the future land use designations drawn from current local comprehensive plans. The distribution map shows generalized representations of the INDEX grid cell data. (2) Activity Units are calculated by simply adding a jurisdiction’s population and employment numbers together. Activity units represent the total amount of activity present in an area and do not distinguish by the mix, or proportion, of the activity that is residential versus commercial.
Distributions by County. As displayed in Figure 2.1 previously, the Preferred Growth Alternative, in comparison to current plans (Growth Targets Extended Alternative), distributes more population growth to King County (42 percent), a relatively equal share of population growth to Pierce County (23 percent), and less to Kitsap (9 percent) and Snohomish (26 percent) counties. On the employment side, the Preferred Growth Alternative decreases the share of job growth distributed to King County (to 57 percent), maintains the same level of job growth in Kitsap County (5 percent), and distributes more job growth to Pierce (17 percent) and especially Snohomish (20 percent) counties.

Distributions by Regional Geographies. As displayed in Figure 2.1, the Preferred Growth Alternative, relative to Growth Targets Extended, focuses a much larger share of future population growth (93 percent) into the region’s urban areas. It significantly reduces the population growth received by rural areas (from 13 percent to 7 percent) and redistributes that growth to the region’s designated urban growth areas. Within urban areas, a significantly greater proportion of population growth is distributed to metropolitan, core and larger cities, with over half of all growth (53 percent) going to cities with regional growth centers. Employment growth remains highly focused in urban areas (97 percent), with core cities, larger cities, and unincorporated urban growth areas receiving slightly larger shares of future employment growth. The great majority of total growth (71 percent) is distributed to cities with regional growth centers. The population and employment growth distributed to unincorporated urban growth areas is envisioned as occurring primarily in areas affiliated for future annexation by cities.

- **Metropolitan Cities.** The metropolitan cities receive 32 percent of the forecast 2000-2040 population growth (540,000 persons) and 42 percent of the forecast employment growth (511,000 jobs).
- **Core Cities.** The core cities receive 21 percent of the forecast population growth (363,000 persons) and 29 percent of the forecast employment growth (352,000 jobs).
- **Larger Cities.** The larger cities receive 11 percent of the forecast population growth (181,000 persons) and 9 percent of the forecast employment growth (111,000 jobs).
- **Small Cities.** The small cities receive 9 percent of the forecast population growth (148,000 persons) and 8 percent of the forecast employment growth (100,000 jobs).
- **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.** These areas receive 21 percent of the forecast population growth (362,000 persons) and 9 percent of the forecast employment growth (114,000 jobs).
- **Rural Areas.** The rural areas also receive 7 percent of the forecast population growth (118,000 persons) and 3 percent of the forecast employment growth (31,000 jobs).

Discussion of Impacts. The Preferred Growth Alternative would share the types of impacts described as common to all alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement identified the growing need for affordable housing as a key potential impact for all alternatives. The Preferred Growth Alternative would also present this need, and the locations affected would be primarily those near where population and employment growth would be focused.

Compared to current plans (Growth Targets Extended), residential development under the Preferred Growth Alternative will be more highly focused into metropolitan, core and larger cities, and reduced in small cities, unincorporated urban and rural areas. By distributing a greater concentration of new population growth into the region’s largely developed urban core, this alternative is likely to produce greater rates of higher density multifamily, small lot single family, infill and redevelopment activity in central places, and lesser rates of lower density single family construction in outlying areas.

Commercial development patterns under the Preferred Growth Alternative will look very similar to those occurring under the Growth Targets Extended as well as the Metropolitan Cities alternatives. The bulk of new job growth would likely be accommodated by intensifying commercial land uses in existing major employment centers (with employment growth being more heavily focused in these areas than population growth). Compared to Growth Targets Extended, the Preferred Growth Alternative distributes slightly higher levels of job growth to core cities, larger cities and unincorporated urban growth areas, to reflect the growth and maturation of suburban employment centers over time (see 5.2 – Land Use).
By concentrating a substantial share of new population and employment growth into already developed urban areas, this alternative promotes the efficient use of existing public infrastructure and services and reduces the need for costly new infrastructure in outlying areas of the region. However, the additional increment of growth in some places may strain existing infrastructure and services, which may necessitate increased investments into maintenance and upgrades in those areas (see 5.7 – Public Services and Utilities).

In comparison to Growth Targets Extended, the balance in the distribution of population and employment growth across counties and regional geographies within counties is significantly improved under the Preferred Growth Alternative. As such, this alternative results in improvements to several key transportation measures such as daily vehicle miles traveled, daily hours of delay, increased transit ridership and reduced single occupant vehicle travel (see 5.3 – Transportation).

The Preferred Growth Alternative envisions that the great majority of new job growth that is distributed to the region’s unincorporated urban growth area will occur in the designated regional manufacturing industrial centers and in areas affiliated for future annexation by cities. Counties and cities may need to establish policies (e.g. development phasing) and increase joint planning efforts for affiliated annexation areas to help channel new development to the most appropriate areas within the unincorporated urban growth area.

The Preferred Growth Alternative significantly reduces levels of population growth, and to a more modest degree job growth, in the region’s rural areas. The alternative envisions capping rural population growth at levels similar to those adopted in current local plans for 2022/25. As such, this alternative substantially improves the likelihood that agricultural lands, natural resources lands and critical areas in the region’s rural areas will be protected from encroachment by new development. Counties may be required to revisit their plans for rural areas and implement new policies to limit rural growth.
Growth Targets Extended Alternative

The Growth Targets Extended Alternative assumes that current local comprehensive plans are extended beyond their current planning horizons of 2022 and 2025 to the year 2040. The following figure presents a conceptual map of the distribution of new growth under Growth Targets Extended.

FIGURE 5-1-7: GROWTH TARGETS EXTENDED ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MAP: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS

Note: See note accompanying Figure 5-1-6 for an explanation of activity units.
Source: Puget Sound Regional Council
### FIGURE 5-1-8: GROWTH TARGETS EXTENDED ALTERNATIVE: 2000-2040 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Metro Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Larger Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
<th>Unincorp. Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>704,000</td>
<td>264,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>704,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>396,000</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>396,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>459,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>459,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>1,219,000</td>
<td>452,000</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>179,000</td>
<td>413,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>1,219,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>545,000</td>
<td>347,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>545,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may vary due to rounding.

### Counties
Under Growth Targets Extended, the majority (59 percent) of the population growth goes to Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties, with King County receiving the remainder. However, the reverse is true of employment, with nearly two-thirds of the anticipated job growth (63 percent) going to King County, and the remaining one-third to the region's other counties. Kitsap County receives its largest share of population growth (9 percent) under this alternative. Snohomish County receives a relatively large share of population growth as well.

### Regional Geographies
Under Growth Targets Extended, the population growth of 1.7 million additional persons from 2000 to 2040 is allocated across the six regional geographies in a relatively dispersed manner, with most growth being allocated to both the most urban places and the most non-urban places. Roughly a quarter of the population growth goes to the region's metropolitan cities, another quarter to the core and larger cities, and the remaining half to small cities, unincorporated urban areas, and rural areas. In contrast, the forecast employment growth of 1.2 million additional jobs occurs in a more highly concentrated pattern, with the bulk of the job growth (73 percent) going to the metropolitan and core cities. The rural areas receive the most population growth (13 percent) in this alternative. The unincorporated urban areas also receive a significant share of the population growth.

- **Metropolitan Cities.** The metropolitan cities receive 26 percent of the forecast 2000-2040 population growth (452,000 persons) and 45 percent of the forecast employment growth (545,000 jobs).
- **Core Cities.** The core cities receive 17 percent of the forecast population growth (286,000 persons) and 28 percent of the forecast employment growth (347,000 jobs).
- **Larger Cities.** The larger cities receive 9 percent of the forecast population growth (151,000 persons) and 7 percent of the forecast employment growth (80,000 jobs).
- **Small cities.** The small cities receive 10 percent of the forecast population growth (179,000 persons) and 9 percent of the forecast employment growth (109,000 jobs).
- **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.** The unincorporated urban areas receive 24 percent of the forecast population growth (413,000 persons) and 8 percent of the forecast employment growth (98,000 jobs).
- **Rural Areas.** The rural areas also receive 13 percent of the forecast population growth (229,000 persons) and 3 percent of the forecast employment growth (41,000 jobs).

### Impacts
Under Growth Targets Extended, concentrated employment growth in the metropolitan and core cities could likely produce significant levels of higher density commercial development in these areas and focus new job growth into existing major employment centers that could be well served by transit, existing infrastructure, and services. At the same time, these facilities and infrastructure could be strained by the additional increment of growth, which could require additional maintenance, service, and investment. For more information, see Chapter 5.7 – Public Services and Utilities.
These cities are already planning for significant employment growth, however the extension to 2040 could mean that some jurisdictions might need to revisit their local comprehensive plans to ensure they are able to accommodate this additional increment.

Residential development patterns could be comparatively more dispersed, with a significant amount of higher density housing likely to be produced in the metropolitan cities, more modest amounts in core and larger cities, a significant amount of lower density single-family housing construction in the outlying areas of the region, especially in unincorporated urban and rural areas, and small amounts of both housing types in the core and larger cities. For each of these geographies, there could be a need for additional planning to accommodate this additional increment.

This alternative allocates the greatest share of population growth (and the second highest combined population and employment growth) to the region’s rural areas, which could provide additional development opportunities in these areas. At the same time, additional development has the potential to impact rural character and lifestyle. Growth in the rural area has the potential to result in additional development pressure on nearby agricultural and resource lands and open spaces. For more information, see Chapter 5.2 – Land Use.

Growth Targets Extended reflects the greatest discrepancy between where future job growth and population growth are being directed, which is reflected in the larger increases in average distances between residences and work and other destinations. Of the five regional growth alternatives, the Growth Targets Extended Alternative produces the highest increases in vehicle miles traveled and average trip times. For more information, see Chapter 5.3 – Transportation.
METROPOLITAN CITIES ALTERNATIVE

The Metropolitan Cities Alternative represents the most concentrated growth pattern of the alternatives. The following figure presents a conceptual map of the distribution of new growth under Metropolitan Cities.

FIGURE 5-1-9: METROPOLITAN CITIES ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MAP:
SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS

Note: See note accompanying Figure 5-1-6 for an explanation of activity units.
Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, 2006
## FIGURE 5-1-10: METROPOLITAN CITIES ALTERNATIVE: 2000-2040 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Metro Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Larger Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
<th>Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>443,000</td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>406,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>685,000</td>
<td>428,000</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may vary due to rounding.

### Counties

The distribution of employment growth across the four counties is similar to Growth Targets Extended, with slightly more job growth (68 percent) going to King County. Under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, King County also receives the largest share of regional population growth (58 percent). Both Kitsap and Snohomish counties receive their smallest shares of population and employment growth in this alternative.

### Regional Geographies

In the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, the majority of the forecast 2000-2040 growth in population and employment (65 percent and 75 percent, respectively) is directed to the region’s metropolitan and core cities. The metropolitan cities receive their largest shares of population (40 percent) and employment (45 percent) growth under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative. The core cities receive the greatest share of employment growth in equal amounts (30 percent) under both the Metropolitan Cities and the Larger Cities alternatives. The small cities, unincorporated areas and rural areas receive much less, often the least amounts of, population and employment growth under this alternative.

- **Metropolitan Cities.** The metropolitan cities receive 40 percent of the forecast 2000-2040 population growth (685,000 persons) and 45 percent of the forecast employment growth (549,000 jobs), which is 233,000 more persons and 4,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Core Cities.** The core cities receive 25 percent of the forecast population growth (428,000 persons) and 30 percent of the forecast employment growth (366,000 jobs), which is 142,000 more persons and 19,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Larger Cities.** The larger cities receive 15 percent of the forecast population growth (257,000 persons) and 10 percent of the forecast employment growth (122,000 jobs), which is 105,000 more persons and 42,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Small cities.** The small cities receive 10 percent of the forecast population growth (171,000 persons) and 5 percent of the forecast employment growth (61,000 jobs), which is 8,000 fewer persons and 48,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.** The unincorporated urban areas receive 5 percent of the forecast growth in population (86,000 persons) and employment (61,000 jobs), which is 328,000 fewer persons and 37,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Rural Areas.** The rural areas also receive 5 percent of the forecast growth in population (86,000 persons) and employment (61,000 jobs), which is 144,000 fewer persons and 20,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
Impacts

Under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, both employment growth and population growth are highly concentrated within the region’s metropolitan and core cities, and to a more moderate degree, in the larger cities. By directing growth to already built urban areas where there is less vacant developable land, this development alternative could likely encourage the highest rates of infill and redevelopment activity. Similar to the Growth Targets Extended Alternative, under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, metropolitan and core cities could potentially need to revisit existing comprehensive plans, given the level of growth allocated to them.

The levels of growth and development allocated under this alternative could impact existing neighborhoods in metropolitan, core and larger cities, as both more (and potentially larger) buildings are developed to accommodate this growth. The growth could also impact traffic congestion, service levels for all types of infrastructure, and could potentially require upgrades and retrofits to existing utilities. For more information, see Chapter 5.7 – Public Services and Utilities.

Focusing growth into urban areas (and to cities in general) could support the goal of directing future growth to the region’s designated regional growth and manufacturing industrial centers to improve jobs and housing balances. Metropolitan cities, core cities, and many of the larger cities might likely see greater amounts of higher density commercial, mixed use, multifamily, and non-traditional single-family development than under Growth Targets Extended.

By channeling growth to the region’s urban cores, the Metropolitan Cities Alternative allocates the least amount of population and employment growth to the region’s unincorporated urban and rural areas of any of the alternatives. The amount of residential growth allocated for the period between 2000 and 2040 for unincorporated urban areas (86,000) and rural areas (86,000) are less than currently adopted Growth Targets for 2000-2022/2025 for these areas (267,000 and 127,000 respectively). Achieving the allocations under this alternative could potentially limit development opportunities in the region’s unincorporated urban and rural areas and might necessitate planning actions to limit growth.

These actions could potentially impact the rural areas in a number of ways, ranging from potentially limiting job and development opportunities, to reducing the potential for conflicts between non-compatible uses. This alternative might provide the greatest potential for maintaining the existing character, lifestyle, and development patterns in these areas.

By limiting growth in close proximity to the region’s agricultural and resource lands and open spaces, Metropolitan Cities Alternative has the potential to offer the most protection against development pressures on these lands. For more information, see Chapter 5.2 – Land Use.

The Metropolitan Cities Alternative allocates a closer ratio of population and employment to many of the regional geographies as compared to Growth Targets Extended. This closer ratio, and the higher levels of existing and planned transit services and facilities in the metropolitan and core cities, produces the highest transit access to work and non-work destinations under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative. Transit ridership is highest in this alternative and single occupancy vehicle travel lowest. For more information, see Chapter 5.3 – Transportation.
LARGER CITIES ALTERNATIVE

The Larger Cities Alternative, like the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, assumes existing suburban cities in the region would accommodate the bulk of future population and employment growth. The following figure presents a conceptual map of the distribution of new growth under the Larger Cities Alternative.

FIGURE 5-1-11: LARGER CITIES ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MAP: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS

Note: See note accompanying Figure 5-1-6 for an explanation of activity units.
Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, 2006
### FIGURE 5-1-12: LARGER CITIES ALTERNATIVE: 2000-2040 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Metro Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Larger Cities</th>
<th>Small cities</th>
<th>Unincorp. Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>342,000</td>
<td>514,000</td>
<td>514,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers may vary due to rounding.

### Counties

Like the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, the growth allocations under the Larger Cities Alternative focus the majority, albeit slightly less, of the forecast population (57 percent) and employment (63 percent) into King County. Pierce County receives its smallest share of population (17 percent) and employment (14 percent) growth in this alternative. Kitsap and Snohomish counties also receive relatively small shares of population and employment growth under the Larger Cities Alternative.

### Regional Geographies

This alternative minimizes the amount of population and employment growth allocated to small cities, unincorporated urban areas, and rural areas in a manner similar to the Metropolitan Cities Alternative. However, whereas the Metropolitan Cities Alternative focuses the bulk of the remaining growth into the metropolitan and core cities, the Larger Cities Alternative shifts the balance of the region’s forecast growth toward the larger cities, with less going to the metropolitan cities. The core and larger cities receive their largest shares of population and employment growth under this alternative.

- **Metropolitan Cities.** The metropolitan cities receive 20 percent of the forecast 2000-2040 growth in population (342,000 persons) and employment (244,000 jobs), which is 110,000 fewer persons and 301,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Core Cities.** The core cities receive 30 percent of the forecast growth in population (514,000 persons) and employment (366,000 jobs), which is 227,000 more persons and 19,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Larger Cities.** The larger cities also receive 30 percent of the forecast growth in population (514,000 persons) and employment (366,000 jobs), which is 362,000 more persons and 286,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Small cities.** The small cities receive 5 percent of the forecast growth in population (86,000 persons) and employment (61,000 jobs), which is 94,000 fewer persons and 48,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.** The unincorporated urban areas receive 10 percent of the forecast growth in population (171,000 persons) and employment (122,000 jobs), which is 242,000 fewer persons and 24,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.

- **Rural Areas.** The rural areas receive 5 percent of the forecast growth in population (86,000 persons) and employment (61,000 jobs), which is 144,000 fewer persons and 20,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
Impacts

By directing the majority of forecast growth to the region’s core and larger cities (in contrast to metropolitan and core cities under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative), the Larger Cities Alternative may result in relatively high density housing and commercial development throughout the four-county region (albeit at a slightly lower density relative to the Metropolitan Cities Alternative). Population and employment growth, while still relatively concentrated within the region’s urban core, is more evenly distributed between major urban activity centers in the metropolitan and core cities and smaller activity centers in the larger cities.

Under this alternative, residential growth allocations to metropolitan cities would be somewhat higher between 2000 and 2040 (342,000) as compared to currently adopted Growth Targets for 2000-2022/2025 (248,000). For other regional geographies, it is the reverse. The amount of residential growth allocated for the period between 2000 and 2040 for small cities (86,000) unincorporated urban areas (171,000) and rural areas (86,000) are all less than currently adopted Growth Targets for 2000-2022/2025 (117,000, 267,000 and 127,000 respectively). Achieving the allocations under this alternative could potentially limit development opportunities in these cities and areas and might necessitate planning actions to limit growth. The impacts to these areas from actions such as these would be similar to the impacts under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative.

For other regional geographies, particularly larger cities and to a lesser extent core cities, the growth is much higher than current Growth Targets. This could mean that some jurisdictions might need to revisit their local comprehensive plans to ensure they are able to accommodate this additional increment.

The region’s larger cities would accommodate significantly higher amounts of both population and employment growth in this alternative. Similar to the Metropolitan Cities Alternative, the levels of growth and development allocated under this alternative could impact existing neighborhoods in metropolitan cities (but to a lesser extent than under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative), core cities and larger cities (but to a greater extent than under the Metropolitan Cities Alternative), as both more (and potentially larger) buildings are developed to accommodate this growth. The growth could also impact traffic congestion, service levels for all types of infrastructure, and could potentially require upgrades and retrofits to existing utilities. For more information, see Chapter 5.7 – Public Services and Utilities.

The Larger Cities Alternative results in relatively the same level of potential impacts and development pressures in these cities and rural, agricultural, and natural resource areas as in the Metropolitan Cities Alternative. The potential impacts on the rural area could take a number of forms, ranging from potentially limiting job and development opportunities to reducing the potential for conflicts between non-compatible uses. This alternative might provide the greatest potential for maintaining the existing character, lifestyle, and development patterns in these areas. For more information, see Chapter 5.3 – Land Use.

The slightly more dispersed, yet still urban, focus of growth under Larger Cities Alternative creates a situation where transit ridership is lower for work trips and higher for non-work trips than in Growth Targets Extended, reflecting likely improvements in jobs and housing balances in the region. For more information, see Chapter 5.3 – Transportation.
SMALLER CITIES ALTERNATIVE

The Smaller Cities Alternative represents the most dispersed growth pattern of the five alternatives. The following figure presents a conceptual map of the distribution of new growth under the Smaller Cities Alternative.

FIGURE 5-1-13: SMALLER CITIES ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MAP: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS

Note: See note accompanying Figure 5-1-6 for an explanation of activity units.
Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, 2006
### FIGURE 5-1-14: SMALLER CITIES ALTERNATIVE: 2000-2040 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro Cities</th>
<th>Core Cities</th>
<th>Larger Cities</th>
<th>Small cities</th>
<th>Unincorp. Urban Areas</th>
<th>Rural Areas</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>164,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION**

|        | Population   | 171,000     | 171,000       | 86,000       | 514,000               | 599,000     | 171,000 | 1,712,000 |
|        | Employment   | 122,000     | 122,000       | 61,000       | 366,000               | 427,000     | 122,000 | 1,219,000 |

Note: Numbers may vary due to rounding.

### Counties

The distribution of population growth across the four counties is similar to Growth Targets Extended, with slightly less population going to King and Kitsap counties, and slightly more to Pierce and Snohomish counties. Pierce and Snohomish counties receive their largest shares of population growth (26 and 27 percent, respectively) under the Smaller Cities Alternative, and King County its smallest share (39 percent).

### Regional Geographies

In this alternative, the majority of the forecast 2000-2040 growth in population and employment (75 percent) is directed to the region’s outlying areas comprised of small cities, unincorporated urban areas, and rural areas. The small cities and unincorporated urban areas receive, by far, their largest shares (30 and 35 percent, respectively) of population and employment growth under the Smaller Cities Alternative. The rural areas also receive their largest share of total growth, with the most employment growth (10 percent) and a relatively large share of population growth. Metropolitan, core suburban, and larger cities receive the smallest amounts of population and employment growth under the Smaller Cities Alternative.

- **Metropolitan Cities.** The metropolitan cities receive 10 percent of the forecast 2000-2040 growth in population (171,000 persons) and employment (122,000 jobs), which is 281,000 fewer persons and 423,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
- **Core Cities.** The core cities also receive 10 percent of the forecast growth in population (171,000 persons) and employment (122,000 jobs), which is 115,000 fewer persons and 225,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
- **Larger Cities.** The larger cities receive 5 percent of the forecast growth in population (86,000 persons) and employment (61,000 jobs), which is 66,000 fewer persons and 19,000 fewer jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
- **Small cities.** The small cities receive 30 percent of the forecast growth in population (514,000 persons) and employment (366,000 jobs), which is 334,000 more persons and 257,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
- **Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas.** The unincorporated urban areas receive 35 percent of the forecast growth in population (599,000 persons) and employment (427,000 jobs), which is 186,000 more persons and 329,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
- **Rural Areas.** The rural areas receive 10 percent of the forecast growth in population (171,000 persons) and employment (122,000 jobs), which is 58,000 fewer persons and 81,000 more jobs than under Growth Targets Extended.
Impacts

Of the five alternatives, the Smaller Cities Alternative directs the greatest amount of population and employment growth, in equal shares, to the region’s small cities, unincorporated urban areas, and rural areas. Compared to Growth Targets Extended, this alternative allocates significantly more employment growth to each of these outlying regional geographies, with more population growth assigned to the small cities and unincorporated urban areas, and the second highest share population growth going to rural areas.

By directing the majority of population and employment growth to the region’s outlying areas where there is considerably more vacant developable land, the Smaller Cities Alternative could likely produce the greatest amount of low-density single-family housing and commercial development at the farthest distances from the region’s existing urban activity centers.

Under this alternative, residential growth allocations to metropolitan cities would be less between 2000 and 2040 (171,000) as compared to currently adopted Growth Targets for 2000-2022/2025 (248,000). For core and larger cities, and to a lesser extent for rural areas, the allocation under the Smaller Cities Alternative for the period between 2000 and 2040 are fairly similar to their currently adopted Growth Targets for 2000-2022/2025.

For other regional geographies, particularly small cities and to a lesser extent the unincorporated urban areas, the growth is much higher than current Growth Targets. This could mean that some jurisdictions might need to revisit their local comprehensive plans to ensure they are able to accommodate this additional increment. Also, for these cities and areas, the levels of growth and development allocated under this alternative could impact existing neighborhoods as both more (and potentially larger) buildings are developed to accommodate this growth. The growth could also impact traffic congestion, service levels for all types of infrastructure, and could potentially require upgrades and retrofits to existing utilities.

Depending upon how the growth is accommodated, this alternative could likely generate the highest need for additional infrastructure and public services to support new growth in relatively undeveloped areas (See Chapter 5.2 – Land Use and Chapter 5.9 – Public Services and Facilities for more discussion of development patterns and infrastructure).

The distribution of identical population and employment numbers under the Smaller Cities Alternative, as compared to the Growth Targets Extended Alternative, results in better transportation system performance on a variety of regional-level indicators; examples include average trip distances, vehicle miles traveled, and total delay. On other indicators, the larger share of growth to metropolitan and cores cities under the Growth Targets Extended Alternative results in better system performance; examples include transit access to work, and walk/bike mode shares. For more information, see Chapter 5.3 – Transportation.

Similar to Growth Targets Extended, agricultural and resource lands and open spaces in the rural areas could likely experience development pressure, due to higher levels of employment growth, and due to the significant increase in growth in the unincorporated urban areas (See Chapter 5.2 – Land Use).
5.1.3 Cumulative Effects

Depending on the alternative, cumulative impacts and significant unavoidable impacts may vary. Each alternative presents different approaches for managing population growth and directing the location of housing and employment opportunities in the region. Growth planning actions in cities and counties beyond the four-county region may not follow these patterns. These decisions could potentially impact the concentrations of employment or housing within the four-county region. Residential patterns may be more dispersed, with some development occurring in urban or urbanizing areas, and some development also occurring in rural areas. Growth could occur at varying rates throughout the region, and may not be as balanced as envisioned.

Other external factors could also affect population and employment levels in the region include both localized economic conditions as well as larger-scale economic trends. Some businesses could close or relocate in other areas, including outside of the area. This could include larger scale businesses or sectors that could have a regional impact. For instance, manufacturing and warehousing distribution sectors typically rely on siting factors including transportation access, the cost of land, and proximity to other suppliers. Downturns or rapid increases in the economy, or changes at the region's military bases, could also affect the rate of development and demand for housing, and the availability of jobs. The price of land and lending rates and other market factors could also affect the affordability and supply of housing. Also, issues related to housing affordability within the region may also have an impact of shifting some forecasted growth to counties outside or adjacent to the region.

5.1.4 Potential Mitigation Measures

Local governments may implement any number of strategies to help preserve and encourage the production of affordable housing options. Best housing practices also provide several techniques to promote effective housing policy and to direct growth to intended areas. These include:

- Planning practices such as comprehensive planning, buildable lands analyses, performance monitoring, and fair share housing programs. These measures could provide for analysis and tracking of housing issues and needs. If implemented consistently, they may help coordinate tracking and review processes among local jurisdictions in the region.

- Design approaches such as design guidelines, small-lot development, zero lot line development, and reduced (maximum) setback requirements. Mixed use design approaches and planned unit developments also could be used to integrate housing and employment opportunities.

- Regulatory approaches such as zoning changes, minimum density ordinances, performance zoning, inclusionary zoning ordinances, and regulatory review and streamlining.

- Financial incentives such as fee exemptions, density bonuses, tax credits, and transfer of development rights programs. Housing tax levies, public land donations, and non-traditional homeownership opportunities also can provide incentives to facilitate development of planned housing and employment opportunities. Where transfer of development rights programs are used, jurisdictions should consider the use of public proceeds from TDR sales to supplement revenues devoted to affordable housing goals.

In addition to managing growth and directing development, Best housing practices can also assist in promoting affordable housing opportunities. Other potential measures that could be employed locally or regionally in support of affordable housing goals could include:

- Development of consistent definitions for “affordable” and “low-” and “moderate-income” thresholds among different regions. This could assist in monitoring affordable housing measures regionally.
• Adoption of affordable housing targets for local jurisdictions to guide the development, implementation and monitoring of affordable housing strategies and programs.

• Housing targets specific to identified regional growth centers could be established. PSRC funding for regional growth center projects also could be redirected to more strongly emphasize housing development within the regional centers.

• Regular review and updating of local land use regulations can help assure that these regulations are consistent with affordable housing goals. In particular, where density standards are too restrictive, land prices per housing unit may be high. Standards allowing for density increases can have a positive influence on housing affordability.

Other mitigations that relate to the economy might include:

• Measures to preserve adequate land at reasonable cost for land-intensive commercial industries, (e.g., manufacturing, wholesale). The measures noted above also could be used to direct growth and development away from lands that could be used for specific industries. Similar to affordable housing goals, these measures could be directed toward maintaining land prices and may influence the amount and availability of these lands for the intended industries.

• Measures to mitigate transportation impacts, in order to promote economic prosperity and quality of life. This will include a variety of options, ranging from increased investments in transportation infrastructure and services, to traffic calming approaches, and more.

5.1.5 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The growth in population and employment would result in increased demand for the use of land for housing and businesses, which could preclude other uses for currently undeveloped land. New housing stock could be needed, and existing housing stock or businesses could be removed to provide for higher density redevelopment. Depending on where development is directed under the different alternatives, the types of housing and the nature of employment opportunities could change in some areas. And, providing housing affordable to all economic segments could be a challenge, although this might depend on the amount of mitigation implemented. Further, depending on the alternative, additional planning for accommodating or limiting growth will be required in some of the region’s jurisdictions.
Supporting Figures
SIDE-BY-SIDE MAPS SHOWING SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH
The following figure compares the distribution of population and employment as painted using INDEX.

FIGURE 5-1-15: SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MAPS: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 2000 AND 2040 ACTIVITY UNITS
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